

REMARKS

The Office Action dated 8 September 2005 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 4-6, 12, 14, 17 and 20-25 have been amended, claims 6-19 remain as originally filed, and new claim 26 has been added. Thus, claims 4-26 are respectfully submitted for consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 4, 6, 12, 14, 17 and 21-25 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 5-13 and 18-19. By this amendment, claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 4 and 6-13, which were already indicated as being allowable, depend either directly or indirectly from claim 5 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 5, as well as for their additionally recited subject matter.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 14 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,251, 592 to Seki et al. ("Seki"). Additionally, claims 1-4, 14-17, and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,243, 944 to Blumenstock. To the extent that these rejections are applicable to claims 14-17 and 20-25, Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 14 is directed to an on-board fuel vapor emission control system including, *inter alia*, "a vapor collection canister, the vapor collection canister including a housing defining a first port and a second port", "a first conduit providing fluid communication between a fuel tank headspace, the first port of the vapor collection canister, and an intake manifold of the internal combustion engine." Neither Seki nor Blumenstock discloses such an on-board fuel vapor emission control system.

Seki discloses a fuel tank 21 that is connected to canister 27 via a conduit 23. See Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 6, ll. 66-68. The canister 27, in turn, is connected to an intake pipe 2 via a purge cut valve 28 and a conduit 30. See Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 7, ll. 9-10. As such, Seki fails to teach "a first conduit providing fluid communication between a fuel tank headspace, the first port of the vapor collection canister, and an intake manifold of the internal combustion engine." Therefore, Seki cannot anticipate claim 14 and this rejection under § 102 should be withdrawn.

Similarly, Blumenstock discloses a tank-venting apparatus including a connecting line 12 between an intake pipe 11 and an adsorption filter 14 as well as a supply line 16 between the adsorption filter 14 and a tank 15. See Fig. 1 and col. 3, ll. 20-28. Blumenstock fails to teach "a first conduit providing fluid communication between a fuel tank headspace, the first port of the vapor collection canister, and an intake manifold of the internal combustion engine." Therefore this rejection under § 102 should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as well as for their additionally recited subject matter. Claims 18 and 19 were already indicated as being allowable. In addition, claim 26 recites similar subject matter to the allowed subject matter recited in allowable claim 5.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method for measuring saturation including, *inter alia*, "monitoring an adsorption front in the vapor collection canister," which includes a housing, an adsorbent that is disposed in the housing and a plurality of temperature sensors exposed to the adsorbent, and the housing includes a first wall, a second wall and a third wall that extends between the first wall and the second wall. Thus, claim 20 recites a method for measuring saturation of an adsorbent in a vapor collection canister as recited in allowable claim 5.

Claims 21-25 depend from independent claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as well as for their additionally recited subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this reply, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution of the application.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-1641. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,



Scott J. Ansell
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No.: 35,035

Customer No. 26633

Date: 8 December 2005

Heller Ehrman LLP
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 912-2000
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020